

people. We thus find sometimes acrimonious language used by the Virasaivas about Vaishnavas and the Vaishnavas about the Saivas. In later years, the better side of the teaching which is the more difficult to follow has been neglected but the slogan Siva is best or Vishnu is best clung to as the more easy badge of sect. The two schools had much in common and could have worked together for popular uplift. They formed into opposing camps Instead and are not unwilling to nurse their differences even to-day.

We need not feel surprised at this. Deterioration and mistake of this kind are common enough occurrence in religions. The treatment of each name for God as the name of a different person is an error to which all religions have succumbed. The Jews worshipped the one and only God, but they admitted there were other gods. Christian and Muhammadan to-day seem to make the same mistake. Man is yet far in religion from the ideal position of treating the names and descriptions of God in vogue among various peoples as so many efforts to describe the Supreme Being who is one and not more than one. Like children who may quarrel about the greatness of the sun who lights their streets, man yet in the childhood of spiritual growth makes others* ideas of God into separate gods lesser than his own and shows impatience at their defects. It is not therefore in a carping spirit that this defect in the teaching of the Sivasaranas and the Haridasas as

popularly
understood is mentioned here. We have to
grow out
of the errors made in the past and to do
this have
first to admit them. Since mankind
started to shape
its religion it has reached various stages
and has been